1 K&L GATES LLP K&L Gates Center 2 210 Sixth Avenue Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222 Telephone: 412.355.6500 3 Facsimile: 412.355.6501 4 Curtis B. Krasik (pro hac vice) 5 curtis.krasik@klgates.com Christopher M. Verdini (pro hac vice) 6 christopher.verdini@klgates.com 7 K&L GATES LLP 8 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard Seventh Floor 9 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: 310.552.5000 10 Facsimile: 310.552.5001 11 Seth A. Gold (SBN 163220) seth.gold@klgates.com 12 Christina N. Goodrich (SBN 261722) christina.goodrich@klgates.com 13 Attorneys for Defendants Gerard Caiafa 14 And Cyclopian Music, Inc. 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 17 GLENN DANZIG, an individual, Case No. 14-CV-02540 RGK (RZx) 18 DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S Plaintiff, 19 FIRST REQUEST FOR VS. 20 **PRODUCTION** GERALD CAIAFA, an individual; 21 CYCLOPIAN MUSIC, INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, 22 inclusive, 23 Defendants. 24 25 26 27 28 PI-3759267 v1 Defendants' Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production

5

4

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27 28

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendants Gerard Caiafa and Cyclopian Music, Inc. (collectively, "Defendants") hereby respond to Plaintiff Glenn Danzig's ("Plaintiff") First Set of Requests for Production (the "Requests").

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The following responses and objections to the Requests are each made on the basis of the information that is presently known and available to Defendants and their attorneys, and include hearsay information and other data inadmissible in evidence at trial although it may be discoverable. Defendants' discovery, investigation, and preparation for trial are not yet completed and are continuing as of the date of this response. Accordingly, the responses and objections set forth below represent only information currently available and known following a reasonable investigation within the time and resources available. Defendants expressly reserve the right to continue discovery and investigation herein for facts, documents, witnesses, and supplemental data that may reveal information that, if presently within Defendants' knowledge, would have been included in these objections and responses. Defendants also expressly reserve the right to present additional information as may be disclosed through continuing investigation and discovery. These responses and objections are made solely for purposes of discovery in this action.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

In addition to the specific objections that may be contained within Defendants' responses to the Requests, each response herein is made subject to the following General Objections, whether or not specifically referenced in those responses. No waiver, express or implied, of any of Defendants' General Objections is intended or should be inferred by the nature of any individual objection or response.

Defendants object to the Requests to the extent they seek information 1. and/or documents that are or may be protected from disclosure, including on the basis of the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, tax privilege, expert

privilege, and any other applicable privilege or bases for protection under Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or other applicable law. Any inadvertent disclosure of such information, or documents reflecting such information, shall not be deemed a waiver of any such privilege or protection.

- 2. Defendants object to providing any requested documents or information to the extent that searching for, and/or providing, such documents or information would be oppressive, unduly burdensome, and unreasonably expensive or would require an unreasonable investigation on the part of Defendants. In responding to the Requests, Defendants have made a reasonable inquiry and search of material and information that are in their possession, custody, or control in those places where information responsive to the Requests is most likely to be found. To the extent Plaintiff seeks to require Defendants to undertake any action beyond that described above, Defendants object to the Requests as unduly burdensome, oppressive, not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, harassing and seeking documents and information not within Defendants' possession, custody, or control.
- 3. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they seek "all" documents or materials of a certain description where it would be unduly burdensome to search for and produce "all" documents or materials technically responsive to those Requests. Defendants will not produce "all" documents where it would be unduly burdensome to do so but will provide documents reasonably sufficient to respond to the subject matter of the Requests.
- 4. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they are not limited in time and/or call for the production of documents outside the applicable statute of limitations and, therefore, are overbroad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 5. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they attempt to alter the plain meaning or understanding of any term or attempt to impose obligations on

12

13

11

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 Defendants that are inconsistent with and/or in addition to those required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

- 6. Defendants object to the definition of "you" and "your," as overbroad and unduly burdensome to the extent that it seeks to encompass documents and things outside the custody and control of the Defendants in this action. Defendants also object to this definition because it includes Caiafa and/or Cyclopian's "attorneys" and, thus, seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine. Defendants also object to this definition because it include "accountants" and, thus, may seek information protected by the tax privilege.
- 7. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they are vague or ambiguous, fail to describe the documents sought with sufficient particularity to allow for a meaningful response by Defendants, or contain undefined terms which are material to Defendants' understanding of the Requests.
- 8. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they seek information and/or documents already in Plaintiff's possession.
- 9. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they seek information and/or documents that are a matter of public record and/or are equally accessible and available to Plaintiff from examination of public records.
- Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they seek information and/or documents outside of Defendants' possession, custody or control.
- 11. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent that they seek disclosure of information that may be confidential, proprietary, commercially sensitive, or trade secret information. Defendants object to providing any such documents and/or information in the absence of a mutually-agreeable protective order protecting Defendants' confidentiality rights in such document or information and limiting their use to this action. Accordingly, Defendants' agreement to produce documents and information that are or contain confidential, proprietary, commercially sensitive, or

trade secret information shall mean upon entry of such a mutually-agreeable protective order, which to date Plaintiff has refused to enter into.

- 12. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent they seek the disclosure of information protected by the right of privacy or any analogous right of Defendants, its employees, and/or or any other third parties under California and federal law.
- 13. To the extent that Defendants do not object in whole or in part to a Request and respond that they will produce documents in response to that Request, such response is not a representation by Defendants that any such documents exist but that if such documents do exist and are located after a reasonably diligent search, Defendants will produce those documents subject to their objections.
- 14. Defendants' investigation of facts and discovery of documents relating to this action is continuing. Defendants' objections and responses to the Requests are based only upon such information available to and known to Defendants at the time of response. Defendants reserve the right to modify and/or supplement any and all of their objections and responses to the Requests as additional information and/or documents are obtained or become available or known to Defendants.
- 15. Without waiving or limiting the foregoing General Objections, or any of the Specific Objections set forth herein, Defendants provide the responses below, preserving and intending to preserve:
 - a. the right to object to, *inter alia*, the relevancy, materiality, privilege or admissibility of evidence and/or any subject thereof;
 - b. the right to object on any ground to the use of evidence and/or the information contained therein in any proceeding; and
 - c. the right to object, upon any ground, to any demand for further responses to the Requests or to any other discovery request involving or relating to the subject matter of the Requests to which answers are herein or hereafter given.

SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

Defendants incorporate by reference, as if set forth therein, each of the foregoing General Objections in the following responses.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

If you deny that it was plaintiff's original idea to use the Fiend Skull design in connection with the Misfits, all writings that support that denial. (For purposes of these requests, "writings" include, but are not limited to, writings, recordings, photographs, originals and duplicates as those terms are defined in FRE 1001, whether stored in physical, electronic, or any other form. For purposes of these requests, "you" and "your" mean, individually and collectively, Caiafa and Cyclopian, and any person or entity acting on behalf of either or both of them including, but not limited to, any manager, agent, attorney, accountant, or merchandiser.)

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 1 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous as to the phrase "in connection with the Misfits." Defendants also object to Request No. 1 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections,
Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce
responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after reasonable investigation and
which were not previously provided to or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and
Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

If you contend that any person or entity other than plaintiff first incorporated the Fiend Skull design for use in connection with the Misfits before plaintiff did so, all writings that support that contention.

RESPONSE:

: 13

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 2 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous as to the phrase "in connection with the Misfits." Defendants further object to Request No. 2 on the grounds that it is based on a false premise. Defendants also object to Request No. 2 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

If you contend that the Fiend Skull design was not associated [sic] the Misfits when plaintiff was a member of the group, all writings that support that contention.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 3 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous as to the phrase "was not associated [with] the Misfits" Defendants further object to Request No. 3 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff.

Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Defendants also object to Request No. 3 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense

in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after reasonable investigation and which were not previously provided to or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

If you contend that plaintiff abandoned any right to commercially exploit the Fiend Skull design, all writings that support that contention.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 4 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections,
Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce
responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after reasonable investigation and
which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and
Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

All writings that refer or relate to the creation of the Fiend Skull design as used in connection with the Misfits.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 5 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous as to the use of the undefined phrases "creation

of' and "the Misfits." Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants further object to Request No. 5 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

All writings that refer or relate to the creation of the Misfits "Horror Font" logo and other related designs, logos and artwork including, but not limited to, U.S. Trademark Registration Nos. 2,634,215 and 2,735,848 (individually and collectively, the "Misfits Marks").

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 6 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous as to the use of the undefined phrase "creation of." Defendants further object to Request No. 6 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

If you contend that you created any of the Misfits Marks, all writings that you contend support that contention.

RESPONSE:

-19

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 7 on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous as to the use of the undefined word "created." Defendants further object to Request No. 7 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

If you contend that plaintiff abandoned any right to commercially exploit any Misfits Mark, all writings that support that contention.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 8 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to Request No. 8 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

Your complete file concerning the lawsuit entitled *Gerald Caiafa*, *Paul Caiafa*, *Frank Licata and Julio Valverde v. Glenn Anzalone p/k/a Danzig and dba Plan 9 Records and Caroline Records, Inc.*, 92 Civ. 6908 (LP) (the "Lawsuit") including, but not limited to, all pleadings, correspondence, discovery requests, discovery responses, deposition transcripts, hearing transcripts, settlement briefs, and all other material

produced, propounded, filed, exchanged or communicated by the parties in the course of or in connection with the 1992 Lawsuit, whether informally or formally through discovery or otherwise.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 9 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 9 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

All writings that refer or relate to the settlement agreement dated as of December 31, 1994 (the "Agreement"), including, but not limited to, the Agreement, all drafts of the Agreement, all writings relating to or reflecting negotiations of the Agreement, and all "marked up" drafts of the Agreement.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 10 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 10 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

All writings that discuss, reflect or communicate any terms of the Agreement, including, but not limited to, all writings between you, on the one hand, and on the other hand, plaintiff or any representative of plaintiff, and all writings between you and any third party.

RESPONSE:

-12

·13

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 11 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 11 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

All writings referring to the Agreement and rights to use the Misfits Marks.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 12 to the extent that it seeks documentation or other information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants further object to Request No. 12 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

All writings referring to the Agreement and rights to use the Fiend Skull design. **RESPONSE:**

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 13 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 13 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

All writings that constitute or reflect any, contract, license, amendment, modification, or other agreement between you and Hot Topic concerning the Fiend Skull design.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 14 on the grounds that it calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

.13

: 19

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

All writings that constitute or reflect any, contract, license, amendment, modification, or other agreement between you and Hot Topic concerning any Misfits Mark.

RESPONSE:

8.

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 15 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

All writings that refer or relate to whether plaintiff could license the Fiend Skull design to Hot Topic.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 16 to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

All writings that refer or relate to whether plaintiff could license any Misfits Mark to Hot Topic.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 17 to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants further object to Request No. 17 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

All writings that contain any statement, express or implied, from you to Hot Topic that if Hot Topic were to license the Fiend Skull design from plaintiff, Hot Topic could or would incur any liability to you.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 18 on the grounds that it calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-

privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

All writings that contain any statement, express or implied, from you to Hot Topic that if Hot Topic were to license the Fiend Skull design from plaintiff, you could or would sue Hot Topic.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 19 on the grounds that it calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

All writings that contain any statement, express or implied, from you to Hot Topic that if Hot Topic were to license any Misfits Mark from plaintiff, Hot Topic could or would incur liability to you.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 20 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by

the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

All writings that contain any statement, express or implied, from you to Hot Topic that if Hot Topic were to license any Misfits Mark from plaintiff, you could or would sue Hot Topic.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 21 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

All writings that reflect or contain any statement by you to Hot Topic concerning actions you would take in the event that Hot Topic agreed to purchase or purchased from plaintiff any purported right to sell merchandise bearing the Fiend Skull design.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 22 to the extent that Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

Subject to the foregoing General Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

All writings that reflect or contain any statement by you to Hot Topic concerning actions you would take in the event that Hot Topic agreed to purchase or purchased from plaintiff any right to sell merchandise bearing any Misfits Mark.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 23 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any request by Hot Topic to you to consent to Hot Topic licensing designs incorporating the Fiend Skull from plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 24 to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants

further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any request by Hot Topic to you to consent to Hot Topic licensing designs incorporating any Misfits Mark from plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 25 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any statement by you to Hot Topic that you would not consent to Hot Topic licensing the Fiend Skull designs from plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 26 to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any statement by you to Hot Topic that you would not consent to Hot Topic licensing any Misfits Mark from plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 27 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any request by any retailer to you to consent to the retailer licensing the Fiend Skull from plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 28 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29

All writings that refer to or reflect any representation by you to any wholesaler or retailer that plaintiff has no right to license any Misfits Mark.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 29 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30

All writings that refer to or reflect any representation by you to any wholesaler or retailer that you own the exclusive right to license the Misfits Marks.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 30 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31

All writings that refer to or reflect any representation by you to any wholesaler or retailer that plaintiff has no right to license the Fiend Skull design.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 31 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32

All writings that refer to or reflect any representation by you to any wholesaler or retailer that you own the exclusive right to license the Fiend Skull design.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 32 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33

All royalty or other statements or accountings you have received from any retailer including, but not limited to, Hot Topic, during the period from April 3, 2010 to the present reflecting revenues from sales of products bearing the Fiend Skull design.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object to Request No. 33 on the grounds that it seeks disclosure of information that is confidential, proprietary, commercially sensitive, or trade secret information. Defendants object to providing such documents and/or information in the absence of a mutually-agreeable protective order protecting Defendants' confidentiality rights in such document or information and limiting their use to this action. Defendants further object to Request No. 33 on the grounds that it calls for the production of documents from periods outside the applicable statute of limitations. Defendants also object to Request No. 33 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly

burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants object to this Request to the extent it calls for information and/or documents subject to the tax privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:

All royalty or other statements or accountings you have received from any retailer including, but not limited to, Hot Topic, during the period from April 3, 2010 to the present reflecting revenues from sales of products bearing the any Misfits Mark.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object to Request No. 34 on the grounds that it seeks disclosure of information that is confidential, proprietary, commercially sensitive, or trade secret information. Defendants objects to providing such documents and/or information in the absence of a mutually-agreeable protective order protecting Defendants' confidentiality rights in such document or information and limiting their use to this action. Defendants further object to Request No. 34 on the grounds that it calls for the production of documents from periods outside the applicable statute of limitations. Defendants also object to Request No. 34 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants object to this Request to the extent it calls for information and/or documents subject to the tax privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:

All writings that refer to or reflect any representation by you to any wholesaler or retailer that you own the exclusive right to license any Misfits Mark.

RESPONSE:

. 15

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 35 on the ground that it is identical to and, therefore, duplicative of Request No. 30. Defendants further object to Request No. 35 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:

All writings that refer to or reflect any representation by you to any wholesaler or retailer that plaintiff has no right to license the Fiend Skull design.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 36 on the ground that it is identical to and, therefore, duplicative of Request No. 31.

Defendants further object to Request No. 36 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party. Defendants further object to the extent this Request seeks information subject to a confidentiality or non-disclosure agreement.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any demand that any person or entity cease and desist from selling, manufacturing, advertising, marketing and/or promoting any merchandise bearing any Fiend Skull design, or from any plan to engage in any of the foregoing activities.

RESPONSE:

.13

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 37 to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants further object to Request No. 37 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any demand that any person or entity cease and desist from selling, manufacturing, advertising, marketing and/or promoting any merchandise bearing any Misfits Mark, or from any plan to engage in any of the foregoing activities.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 38 to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants further object to Request No. 38 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by

the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:

All writings that support your statement to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (the "PTO") in application Serial Number 76138226 that you owned the exclusive rights to the trademark "MISFITS," for International Class 041 goods.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 39 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or other information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 39 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76138226 that the first use of the trademark "MISFITS," for International Class 041 goods was October 5, 1999.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 40 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 40 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not

relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76167459, that you owned the exclusive rights to the trademark "MISFITS" for International Classes 16 and 41 goods.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 41 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 41 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:

All writings [sic] your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76167459, that the first use of the trademark "MISFITS" for International Classes 16 and 41 goods was April 19, 1994.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 42 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 42 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not

relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 43:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76152924, that you owned the exclusive rights to the trademark consisting of the word "MISFITS" in stylized script for International Classes 9, 16 and 25 goods.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 43 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 43 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 44:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76152924, that the first use of the trademark consisting of the word "MISFITS" in stylized script for International Classes 9, 16 and 25 goods was April 19, 1994.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 44 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 44 on the grounds that it is

overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 45:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76402336, that you owned the exclusive rights to the trademark consisting of a stylized skull referred to as the "Fiend Skull" for International Class 14 goods.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 45 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 46:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76402336, that the first use of the trademark consisting of a stylized skull referred to as the "Fiend Skull" for International Class 14 goods was October 1, 1978.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 46 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 46 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 47:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76605515, that you owned the exclusive rights to the trademark consisting of consisting of the word "MISFITS" for International Class 25 goods.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 47 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 47 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 48:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76605515, that the first use of the trademark consisting of the word "MISFITS" for International Class 25 goods was April 19, 1994.

RESPONSE:

-11

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 48 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 48 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 49:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76605840, that you owned the exclusive rights to the trademark consisting of the word "MISFITS" in the same stylized script as the mark registered as Registration Number 2735945 for International Class 25 goods.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 49 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 49 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 50:

All writings that support your statement to the PTO in application Serial Number 76605840, that the first use of the trademark consisting of the word

"MISFITS" in the same stylized script as the mark registered as Registration Number 2735945 for International Class 25 goods was April 19, 1994.

RESPONSE:

. 19

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 50 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity. Defendants also object to Request No. 50 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 51:

All writings filed with the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office in support of your registration of the Misfits Marks.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 51 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to Request No. 51 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 52:

All pleadings, correspondence, discovery requests, discovery responses, deposition transcripts, hearing transcripts, settlement briefs, and all other material produced, propounded, filed, exchanged or communicated by the parties in the course of or in connection with the registration, opposition and cancellation proceedings

before the PTO in application Serial Numbers 76138226, 76167459, 3 76152924, 76402336, 76605515, and 76605840, or any of them; and/or in the course of or in connection with any opposition, cancellation or other proceedings 5 related to any of those applications.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 52 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants further object to Request No. 52 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 53:

All writings pursuant to which the Fiend Skull design or Misfits Marks related trademarks marks were transferred to Cyclopian.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 53 on the grounds that it is based on a false premise. Defendants further object to Request No. 53 on the grounds that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants also object to Request No. 53 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 54:

Cyclopian's bylaws, articles of incorporation, shareholder's agreements, and any modifications, amendments, or other writings changing the terms thereof.

RESPONSE:

7.

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 54 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55:

All writings that reflect any terms of any agreement between Caiafa and Cyclopian.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 55 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56:

All writings that reflect any terms of any agreement between Paul Caiafa and Cyclopian.

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 56 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 57:

All writings that reflect any terms of any agreement between Frank Licata and Cyclopian.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 57 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58:

All writings that reflect any terms of any agreement between Julio Valverde and Cyclopian.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 58 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by

the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59:

All written agreements that refer or relate to, or that reflect, or change, the ownership interests of Cyclopian, Caiafa, Paul Caiafa, Frank Licata, and Julio Valverde, or any of them, in the Fiend Skull.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 59 on the grounds that it is based on a false premise. Defendants further object to Request No. 59 on the grounds that it seeks documents that are already in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control and/or are matters of public record that are equally available and accessible to Plaintiff. Defendants also object to Request No. 59 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:

All written agreements that refer or relate to, or that reflect, or change, the ownership interests of Cyclopian, Caiafa, Paul Caiafa, Frank Licata, and Julio Valverde, or any of them, in the Misfits Marks, or any of them.

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 60 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:

All written agreements that refer or relate to, or that reflect, or change, the share of revenues to which Cyclopian, Caiafa, Paul Caiafa, Frank Licata, and Julio Valverde, or any of them, are entitled from exploitations of the Fiend Skull.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 61 on the grounds that it is based on a false premise. Defendants further object to Request No. 61 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 62:

All written agreements that refer or relate to, or that reflect, or change, the share of revenues to which Cyclopian, Caiafa, Paul Caiafa, Frank Licata, and Julio Valverde, or any of them, are entitled to receive from exploitations of the Misfits Marks, or any of them.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 62 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to the extent this Request calls for documents and/or information protected by the right to privacy (under California law or any other law) of Defendants and/or any third party.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 63:

All writings that refer to or reflect any use by plaintiff of the Fiend Skull in commerce.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 63 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 64:

All writings that refer to or reflect any use by plaintiff of any of the Misfits Marks in commerce.

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 64 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants further object to Request No. 64 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants will produce responsive, non-privileged documents that refer to or reflect use by plaintiff of the Misfits Marks in connection with his live music concerts that are found after a reasonable investigation.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 65:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, plaintiff's performance or recording as the Misfits.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 65 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, use of any trademarks that you own to advertise or promote plaintiff's live concerts.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 66 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, the use by plaintiff or persons under his control of trademarks you own to misrepresent that the Misfits were performing at his live music concerts.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 67 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 68:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, any damages you suffered as a result of any use of any trademark you own in connection with any live performance by plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 68 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 69:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, any effort by you or anyone acting on your behalf to prevent plaintiff or anyone under his control from using any trademark owned by you in connection with any live performance by plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 69 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 70:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, any effort by you or anyone acting on your behalf to prevent plaintiff or anyone under his control from using any trademark owned by you in connection with any matter.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 70 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants further object to Request No. 70 on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and calls for the production of documents that are not relevant to any claim or defense in this action and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 71:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect, any confusion as to whether the Misfits are or were performing at plaintiff's concerts.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 71 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, any inquiries as to whether the Misfits were performing with plaintiff.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 72 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, any inquiries as to whether plaintiff had the right to tour and perform as the Misfits.

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 73 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, any harm you have suffered as a result of any use by plaintiff of any trademark you own.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 74 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, the amount of any damages you have suffered as a result of any use by plaintiff of any trademark you own.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 75 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 76:

All writings that refer or relate to, or that reflect or evidence, profits plaintiff has received from any use of any trademark you own.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 76 on the ground that it seeks documents that are already or exclusively in Plaintiff's possession, custody or control. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

. 15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 77: All writings and other materials identified in your initial disclosures herein. **RESPONSE:** In addition to the General Objections, Defendants object to Request No. 77 to the extent that it seeks documentation or other information protected by the attorneyclient privilege and/or work product immunity. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Defendants, upon entry of an appropriate confidentiality order, will produce responsive, non-privileged documents, if any, found after a reasonable investigation and which were not provided to and/or by Plaintiff or his attorneys in the trademark Opposition and Cancellation proceedings pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. Respectfully submitted, K&L-GATES LLP Dated: January 30, 2015 By: Christina N. Goodrich Curtis B. Krasik (pro hac vice) Christopher M. Verdini (pro hac vice) Attorneys for Gerard Caiafa and Cyclopian Music, Inc.

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 Case No. 2:14-CV-02540-RGK-RZ 3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is **K&L GATES** 4 LLP, 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, Seventh Floor, Los Angeles, California 90067. 5 On **January 30, 2015**, I served the foregoing document(s): 6 DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION 8 on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s) addressed and sent as follows: 9 Howard E King 10 Stephen D. Rothschild King Holmes Paterno and Berliner LLP 11 1900 Avenue of the Stars 25th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067-4506 310-282-8989 12 Attorneys for Plaintiff Glenn Danzig 13 14 15 **BY MAIL:** (By Following Office Business Practice): I am readily familiar with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is 16 deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I placed such envelope(s) for collection and mailing on that date 17 following ordinary business practice. 18 **FEDERAL:** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction service was made. 19 20 21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and 22 the laws of the United States of America that the above is true and correct. 23 Executed on January 30, 2015, at Los Angeles, California. 24 25 26 27 28 48